

<h1 style="text-align: center;">Project Review Comments</h1>			<b>Type:</b> Concept: Final: Other:		<b>Page</b> 1 <b>of</b> 3
					<b>Date:</b> June 3, 2002
<b>Project:</b> UMR & IWW Restructured Navigation Study – Draft Interim Report			<b>Reviewer:</b>		
			Name: <u>Robin Grawe</u>		
			Organization: <u>Miss. River Citizen Committee</u>		
<b>Location:</b> Upper Miss. River System					
Comment Number	Drawing/ Number	Page/ Space	<b>COMMENT</b>		<b>ACTION</b>

1.	4	47	Figure 4 is a little misleading because of the inconsistent scale.	Concur, graph revised
2.	2.4.2.1.10	49	Perhaps I missed it earlier, but I think it would be helpful to define “delay.” I take it to mean time expended by a tow waiting for the lock to clear. But one could also consider it a delay to double lock. This becomes important because some measures would reduce lockage time even if that tow experienced no delays.	Additional information provided
3.	7	50	Figure 7: What is a “peak monthly average delay”? We could use more explication and detail here. Are there locks where a tow can expect a delay virtually any trip? Are there times of year that are especially bad? During how many months does a lock normally have delays? Perhaps a table would help.	Table added for per site comparison
4.	14	60	Figure 14: This schematic seems to raise more questions than it answers. At first glance, it seems to be a graph that needs more labeling and thus begs a lot of questions. I would suggest eliminating it and letting Figure 19 do the job. Or else leave out “Desired State” but put in dates. But then does it really mean that the completion of the locks and dams had no discernable effect on the rate of degradation?	Concur. The discussion on the environmental impacts schematic has been revised.
5.	2.4.2.4	62	In the next to the last paragraph, are the northern reaches those north of Guttenberg?	Correct.
6.	2.4.3.1	63	In the last paragraph, are non-farm commodities less subject to uncertainty and variability and is that why they are a constant within the scenarios?	Correct.
7.	19	75	The Desired State seems to be defined as a state corresponding to that of 1940. Is this an assumption? A policy decision? An arbitrary choice to illustrate a schematic?	The desired state is not intended to reflect conditions in 1940. The stakeholders will be involved in determining the desired state of the system. This section has been revised.
8.	21	77	I would feel more located if captions referenced Pool numbers as well as islands, sloughs, etc.	Photos deleted.

<b>Project Review Comments</b>			<b>Type:</b>		<b>Page</b> 2 <b>of</b> 3
			Concept: Final: Other:		<b>Date:</b> June 3, 2002
<b>Project:</b> UMR & IWW Restructured Navigation Study – Draft Interim Report			<b>Reviewer:</b>		
			Name: <u>Robin Grawe</u>		
			Organization: <u>Miss. River Citizen Committee</u>		
<b>Location:</b> Upper Miss. River System					
Comment Number	Drawing/ Number	Page/ Space	<b>COMMENT</b>		<b>ACTION</b>

9.	2.5.6.1	106	I hope recreational recommendations will be more specific in the final report. Organizationally, I think the Corps will need specific authorization to manage for recreation. And perhaps channel maintenance plans need to include recreational goals as well. Working on beach plans for the upper pools, I've found a great deal of citizen frustration that beaches originally formed by simple (haphazard perhaps and environmentally insensitive) disposal of dredge material now cannot be maintained similarly, not even a small fraction of them. "They're taking it right by the beach. Why can't they just put some of it there?"	The disposal of dredge material is generally controlled by the least cost least environmentally impacted alternatives. The restructured feasibility study will be looking at modified ways to operate and maintain the 9' channel project, including dredging practices.
10.		111	Last paragraph: Were the NED/NER criteria listed earlier? Could we have a page number? It some ways this is where it all happens. Perhaps there should be a new heading: CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION. Also who will choose? (Poor chap)	Definitions have been provided and recommendation process described.
11.	9	124f	I would hope that the EMP would be more than a model or template but the primary vehicle—minimize new programs and agencies.	Noted.

<h1>Project Review Comments</h1>			<b>Type:</b> Concept: Final: Other:		<b>Page</b> 3 <b>of</b> 3
					<b>Date:</b> June 3, 2002
<b>Project:</b> UMR & IWW Restructured Navigation Study – Draft Interim Report			<b>Reviewer:</b>		
			Name: <u>Robin Grawe</u>		
			Organization: <u>Miss. River Citizen Committee</u>		
<b>Location:</b> Upper Miss. River System					
Comment Number	Drawing/ Number	Page/ Space	<b>COMMENT</b>		<b>ACTION</b>

12.		120	I think the public would appreciate some recommendations of do-able, beyond-dispute actions and measures like mooring cells and full funding for EMP. There must be a few no-brainers.	The guidance for restructuring of the navigation study allowed for identification of measures that could be recommended for implementation prior to completion of the feasibility study. The Interim Report does not contain any recommendations for moving forward with interim measures. Many comments were received that suggested small-scale measures such as mooring cells and guidewall extensions be considered for immediate implementation. These measures have been discussed in past efforts; however, the economic evaluation of small-scale measures has not been completed. In addition, the environmental analysis describing the impacts of incremental traffic increases from these types of measures is also not complete. Both of these evaluations will be included in the feasibility study to allow for selection of a recommended plan
13.			Good show! The approach seems designed to present an array of possibilities which can be presented to a complex public value system. And from a lay perspective, it does not seem dependent on a few abstract formulas which, if slightly off, send the result into great error. As I undersand the study, it contains through the scenario approach some internal checks and balances which are necessary for reliable results and also for fending off special interest attacks.	
14.				

<b>Project Review Comments</b>			<b>Type:</b>		<b>Page</b> 4 <b>of</b> 3
			Concept: Final: Other:		<b>Date:</b> June 3, 2002
<b>Project:</b> UMR & IWW Restructured Navigation Study – Draft Interim Report			<b>Reviewer:</b>		
			Name: <u>Robin Grawe</u>		
			Organization: <u>Miss. River Citizen Committee</u>		
<b>Location:</b> Upper Miss. River System					
Comment Number	Drawing/ Number	Page/ Space	<b>COMMENT</b>		<b>ACTION</b>
